

REMARKS:

Claims 1-25 and 31-32 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 7-15, 19, 22, and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Moring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,159,368). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is as follows:

An assembly for a microarray assay device, comprising:

a microplate having a plurality of discrete array formation areas each formed of a flexible material^{8b} and activated for immobilization of biorecognition materials, and barriers formed between the array formation areas to restrict fluid cross-flow therebetween; and

a vacuum fixture²⁹ defining a top surface²⁵ and an interior chamber²⁸ connectable to a vacuum source, wherein the microplate is mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture so that the array formation areas conform to the top surface of the vacuum fixture, the vacuum fixture further defining a plurality of orifices connected to the interior chamber and opening at the top surface at locations corresponding to the array formation areas when the microplate is mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture.

Applicant respectfully submits that Moring cannot anticipate claim 1, because Moring does not teach "... the vacuum fixture further defining a plurality of orifices connected to the interior chamber and opening at the top surface at locations corresponding to the array formation areas when the microplate is mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture." In Moring, the orifices that are

?
YES
anticipates

connected to the interior chamber do not open at the top surface at locations *arg?*
corresponding to the array formation areas. Instead, the apertures (orifices) 28
extend through the surface 25 of collection plate 24. (Moring, column 22, lines 17-
21; Figures 2 and 3). A separate outlet port 16c (orifice) has an opening at the top
surface at a location corresponding to the filter element 8a (the array formation
area). (Moring, column 18, lines 4-25; column 21, lines 42-51; Figure 2). Therefore,
Moring cannot anticipate claim 1 of the present invention.

intended use
In addition, Moring cannot anticipate claim 1, because Moring does not teach
“... discrete array formation areas each formed of a flexible material and activated
for immobilization of biorecognition materials.” It appears that the Examiner cites
column 30, lines 30-34 of Moring for this teaching. In response, the Applicant
respectfully submits that column 30, lines 30-34 refers to an RNA or DNA filtrate
that can be collected in the microfiltration apparatus of Figures 1 to 3. An RNA or
DNA flow through merely refers to material that passes through the array
formation area. An RNA or DNA flow through is not a discrete array formation
area formed of a flexible material and activated for immobilization of biorecognition
materials. Therefore, Moring cannot anticipate claim 1 of the present invention. *arg?*
intended use?

Moring cannot make instant claim 1 obvious. Moring has no teaching or
suggestion whatsoever of “... the vacuum fixture further defining a plurality of
orifices connected to the interior chamber and opening at the top surface at
locations corresponding to the array formation areas when the microplate is *argument of fact*
mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture.” In the present invention, fixture
32 has an interior chamber 34 connectable to a vacuum source via channels 34a,
and a plurality of orifices 36 located on the top surface and connected to the interior
member. The orifices 36 are located within the depressions 38 in the embodiment of
Fig. 3(a), or at locations corresponding to the bottom of the wells 16 in the
embodiment of Fig. 3(c). When a vacuum is drawn in the interior chamber 34, the
vacuum is communicated via the orifices 36 to create a negative pressure to hold the

bottom of the wells 16 firmly against the top surface of the fixture 32. (Applicant's specification, at p. 8, line 26-p. 9, line 1; Figure 4). Thus, the present invention offers the advantage, that even though the tray 12 is formed of a flexible material, the bottom portions of the wells 16 maintain a high precision flatness to facilitate high-resolution printing and reading of the microarrays. (Applicant's specification, at p. 9, lines 1-4; Figure 4).

The vacuum fixture design of the present invention offers a further advantage in that it may be provided with a micromixing capability by connecting the vacuum chamber 34 to a peristaltic pump which generates alternating positive and negative pressures. As shown in Figs. 5(a) and 5(b), the alternating pressures are communicated by the orifice 36 to the space between the surface of the fixture 32 and the bottom of the well 16, causing the flexible bottom portion of the well to be alternately pushed up and pulled down. This creates a micromixing effect to uniformly mix the solution held in the well. (Applicant's specification, at p. 9, lines 16-22; Figures 5a and 5b). The orifice design of Moring would presumably prohibit alternating pressures, since alternating positive and negative pressure could cause the flow through in the closed bottom well 26 to back up into the filter element 8a (Moring; Figure 3).

intended use?
not immobilized
In addition, Moring cannot make instant claim 1 obvious, because Moring has no teaching or suggestion whatsoever of discrete arrays activated for immobilization of any material, much less of biorecognition materials. On the contrary, as discussed above, Moring teaches that the material of interest passes through the filter membrane instead of being immobilized on the membrane, as taught by the present invention. In Moring, the goal was to design a micro-well microfiltration arrangement that provides for the separate collection from each well, while avoiding cross-contamination due to aerosol formation and/or pendent drops. (Moring, column 3, lines 22-25).

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Moring could not have anticipated or rendered obvious claim 1, because Moring fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 2, 4-6, 7-15, and 19 depend from claim 1 and cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 22 is as follows:

An assembly for a microarray assay device, comprising:

a microplate having a plurality of wells formed of a flexible material and having continuous flat bottoms; and

a vacuum fixture defining a top surface and an interior chamber connectable to a vacuum source, wherein the microplate is mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture so that the bottom of each well conforms to the top surface of the vacuum fixture, the vacuum fixture further defining a plurality of orifices connected to the interior chamber and opening at the top surface at locations corresponding to the bottoms of the wells when the microplate is mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture.

Applicant respectfully submits that Moring cannot anticipate claim 22, because Moring does not teach "... the vacuum fixture further defining a plurality of orifices connected to the interior chamber and opening at the top surface at locations corresponding to the bottoms of the wells when the microplate is mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture." In Moring, the orifices that are connected to the interior chamber do not open at the top surface at locations corresponding to the bottoms of wells. For reasons similar to those discussed above, the orifices that are connected to the interior chamber do not open at the top surface at locations corresponding to either the array formation areas or the bottoms of wells. Therefore, Moring cannot anticipate claim 22 of the present invention. Also for

reasons similar to those discussed above, Moring cannot make instant claim 22 obvious.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Moring could not have anticipated or rendered obvious claim 22, because Moring fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 22 and cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 22. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 3 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moring in view of Mathus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,858,309). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 3 and 16-18 depend from claim 1, and as such include all the limitations of claim 1, and therefore cannot be rendered obvious over Moring for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Mathus cannot remedy the defect of Moring and is not relied upon by the Examiner for such. Instead, the Examiner cites Mathus for teaching microplates and methods for manufacturing microplates, and more specifically, for teaching microplates with a material thickness of 7.5 mils. Mathus neither teaches nor suggests anything related to vacuum fixtures or areas activated for immobilization of materials. *intended use*

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Moring and Mathus could not have made claims 3 and 16-18 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 21, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moring in view of Mohan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,888,830). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 20-21 and 23-24 depend from claims 1 and 22, respectively, and as such include all the limitations of claims 1 and 22, respectively, and therefore cannot be rendered obvious over Moring for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Mohan cannot remedy the defect of Moring and is not relied upon by the Examiner for such. Instead, the Examiner cites Mohan for teaching a capping plate with a plurality of caps that corresponds to an array area and seals the reaction vessel and a cap that has access to an inlet and outlet port and the microplate assembly has a temperature control element. Mohan neither teaches nor suggests ... the vacuum fixture further defining a plurality of orifices connected to the interior chamber and opening at the top surface at locations corresponding to either the array formation areas (as required for claims 20 and 21) or the bottoms of wells (as required for claims 23 and 24) when the microplate is mounted on the top surface of the vacuum fixture.

Ref teaches
Instead, Mohan teaches a drainage channel block 34 with channels 65 aligned with the male Luer connectors 53 of the valve inserts 51 in the manifold valve block 30 so that when the valve inserts are opened, the liquid therein simultaneously drains into the array of interconnected channels. (Mohan, column 11, line 58-column 12, line 1; Figures 7-9). Thus, instead of a vacuum fixture having a top surface corresponding to the well bottoms or array formation areas, Mohan teaches drainage channels simply aligned with the passages 50 of the valve block.

Similarly, a cleavage block 120, which substitutes for the channel block 34 after the washing step, does not have a top surface conforming to the passages 50. The cleavage block includes a vial tray rack 122 mounted in a cavity 123 of the cleavage block 120. The vial rack 122 is loaded with vials 128 for receiving the reaction products from the reaction vessels 12 upon simultaneously opening the valves 51 in the manifold valve block 30. (Mohan, column 13, lines 55-65; Figures 1-3 and 23). Thus, instead of a vacuum fixture having a top surface corresponding

to the well bottoms or array formation areas, Mohan teaches vials 128 simply aligned with the passages 50 of the valve block.

aug?
In addition, neither the channel block 34 nor the cleavage block 120 has a plurality of orifices connected to the interior chamber and opening at the top surface at locations corresponding to the array formation areas or the bottoms of wells. The channel block 34 does not have an internal chamber and does not have orifices corresponding to each passageway. Instead, channels of the channel block are simply aligned with the passages 50 of the valve block to allow the drainage of liquid when the valves are open and the vacuum is applied to the channels. (Mohan, column 11, lines 58-67).

not in claim
Similarly, the cleavage block does not have orifices corresponding to each passageway. Instead, with the opening of the insert valves 51, a vacuum is applied to the single quick connect fitting 60 by the vacuum pump 39 which causes the solvent in the reaction vessels 12 to flow into the array of ninety-six vials 128. (Mohan, column 15, lines 2-10). Therefore, Mohan does not teach or suggest the vacuum fixture of claims 20-21 and 23-24.

intended use
Furthermore, Mohan neither teaches nor suggests anything related to areas activated for immobilization of materials.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Moring and Mohan could not have made claims 20, 21, 23, and 24 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moring in view of Stylli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,858,309). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 25 depends from claim 22, and as such include all the limitations of claim 22, and therefore cannot be rendered obvious over Moring, for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Stylli cannot remedy the defect of Moring and is

Appl. No. 09/675,020
Amdt. Dated August 19, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 19, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 2014-181 (81841.0161)
Customer No. 26021

not relied upon by the Examiner for such. Instead, the Examiner cites Stylli for the teaching of a peristaltic pump. Stylli neither teaches nor suggests anything related to vacuum fixtures or areas activated for immobilization of materials.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Moring and Stylli could not have made claim 25 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments comply with requirements of form and thus may be admitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(a). In addition, admission is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(a) as presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the foregoing remarks, are requested.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6700 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: August 19, 2003

By:


Wei-Ning Yang
Registration No. 38,690
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701